



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/518,359	03/03/2000	William Russell Belknap	ST9-99-086	5222

25696 7590 06/23/2003

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY
P. O. BOX 10356
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicant(s)

09/518,359

Applicant(s)

BELKNAP ET AL. 

Examiner

Jungwon Chang

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-23,25-36 and 38-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,24 and 37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-50 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-23, 25-36 and 38-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky et al. (6,452,609 B1), hereinafter referred to as Katinsky, in view of Yost et al. (US 6,289,380 B1), hereinafter referred to as Yost.

4. As to claims 1 and 19, Katinsky discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method for providing a user interface at a terminal in a network for managing operations including encoding operations performed on media data by selected ones of a plurality of media servers (col. 1, line 60 – col. 2, line 4; col. 10, lines 9-16; col. 12, lines 61-66), the process comprising the steps of:

displaying a graphical user interface at the terminal (figs. 1-9), said interface including a plurality of interface components enabling a user to select a manual encoding

mode for manually starting and stopping manual encoding processes to be performed by selected ones of the servers (col. 6, lines 1-6 and 10-18);

receiving information input by the user specifying a selected one of the media servers, a selected mode of operation, and an encoding operation (col. 4, lines 12-20 and 56-65);

generating commands and associated parameters based on the input information for instructing the selected server to execute the specified encoding operation in accordance with the selected mode of operation (col. 12, lines 61-63; col. 14, lines 13-18); and

transmitting said commands and said associated parameters to said selected server (col. 12, lines 63-66).

5. Katinsky does not specifically disclose centralized user interface at an administrator terminal; a scheduled encoding mode for defining schedules for scheduled encoding processes to be performed by selected ones of the servers. However, Yost disclose centralized user interface at an administrator terminal (col. 3, lines 60-67; col. 4, lines 1-14 and 36-51); a scheduled encoding mode for defining schedules for scheduled encoding processes to be performed by selected ones of the servers (44, fig. 1; col. 4, lines 22-35; col. 12, lines 37-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Katinsky and Yost because Yost's centralized user interface and scheduled encoding mode would increase data throughput by allowing the administrator to control and manage the operation of the

service processing to the user (Katinsky's reference, col. 4, liens 38-48), thereby allowing a user to timely download the desired multimedia content from the appropriate server.

6. As to claim 2, Katinsky discloses each of the media servers is communicatively coupled with at least one corresponding multimedia device capable of generating media data (col. 9, lines 20-24).

7. As to claim 4, Katinsky discloses IP network (col. 3, lines 43-54).

8. As to claim 5, Katinsky and Yost do not specifically use a word an applet. However, Katinsky discloses JavaScript (col. 1, lines 32-40), and Yost discloses web browser (col. 15, lines 17-37). It would have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include applet because Java applet executes within a web browser to quickly and easily download data from server to client, thereby allowing a user to display information on user's window.

9. As to claims 6, 7 and 15, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

10. As to claim 8, Katinsky discloses each of the servers is operative to access at least one corresponding memory device for storing media data, and wherein each of the servers is further operative to record selected portions of encoded media data that are

encoded during said encoding operations (1010, 1012, 1014, fig. 10; col. 9, lines 20-46 and 63-67; col. 10, lines 9-16).

11. As to claims 9 and 14, Katinsky further discloses displaying a name selection interface component enabling the user specify an asset name for said encoded portion of media data to be stored at said selected storage location (col. 5, lines 10-16; col. 4, lines 56-65).

12. As to claim 10, Katinsky discloses overwriting option selection (col. 11, lines 34-38; col. 9, lines 60-61).

13. As to claims 11-13, Katinsky does not specifically disclose a plurality of end user terminals communicatively coupled to the administrator terminal and to the servers. However, Yost discloses a plurality of end user terminals (40a-40e, fig. 1) communicatively coupled to the administrator terminal (20, fig. 1) and to the servers (12, 14, fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Katinsky and Yost because Yost's communicatively coupling between them would increase throughput by allowing the administrator to control and manage the operation of the service processing to the user (Katinsky's reference, col. 4, lines 38-48), thereby allowing a user to download the desired multimedia content from the appropriate server.

14. As to claims 16 and 17, Katinsky does not specifically disclose notification operations include determining success or failure of the streaming specified by the corresponding playback operation. However, Yost discloses notification operations associated with corresponding ones of the playback operations (col. 13, lines 33-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Katinsky and Yost because Yost's notification operations would improve the performance of Katinsky's system by eliminating costs associated failed communication attempts while the system is down or crash, thereby the user may specify particular actions to be performed.

15. As to claim 18, Katinsky does not specifically disclose wherein the administrator terminal includes a processing unit, a browser application executed by the processing unit, and a display unit (col. 10, lines 35-48; col. 12, lines 10-18). However, Yost disclose wherein the administrator terminal includes a processing unit, a browser application executed by the processing unit, and a display unit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Katinsky and Yost because Yost's peripheral devices at the administrator's system would provide expansion capability of Katinsky's system by allowing the administrator to remotely view the user's activity, manage and control the operation of the service processing to the user.

16. As to claim 20, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 2.

17. As to claim 21, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 18.
18. As to claim 22, Katinsky discloses the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. In addition, Katinsky discloses a machine readable storage device having stored therein encoding instructions for executing a process of providing a user interface (1010, 1012, 1014, fig. 10; col. 9, lines 20-46 and 63-67; col. 10, lines 9-16).
19. As to claim 23, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 2.
20. As to claim 25, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 4.
21. As to claim 26, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 5.
22. As to claims 27 and 28, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1.
23. As to claim 29, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 8.
24. As to claim 30, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 9.
25. As to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 10.
26. As to claims 32-34, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 11-13.

27. As to claim 35, Yost and Katinsky do not specifically use a word an applet. However, Yost discloses web browser (col. 15, lines 17-37); and Katinsky discloses JavaScript (col. 1, lines 32-40). It would have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include applet because Java applet executes within a web browser to quickly and easily download data from server to client, thereby allowing a user to display information on user's window.

28. As to claim 36, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 2.

29. As to claim 38, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 4.

30. As to claims 39, 40 and 47, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

31. As to claim 41, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 8.

32. As to claim 42, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 9.

33. As to claim 43, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 10.

34. As to claims 44-46, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 11-13.

Art Unit: 2154

35. As to claims 48 and 49, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 16 and 17.

36. As to claim 50, Katinsky discloses the client also includes a processing unit, a browser application executed by the processing unit, and a display unit (1030, 1004, fig. 10; col. 10, lines 17-25).

37. Claims 3, 24, and 37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

38. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Battat et al, patent 6,289,380 B1, Cox, patent 6,510,466 B1, Arita, patent 6,446,082 B1, Yoshio et al, patent 6,567,612 B2, Berson, patent 6,532,459 B1, Stern, patent 6,486,892 B1, Immerman et al, patent 6,574,617 B1 disclose methods and systems for reproduction control information.

Art Unit: 2154

39. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is (703)305-9669. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703)308-9052. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-7239 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-9669.

Jungwon Chang
June 6, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. El Hadj". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long, sweeping tail that extends downwards and to the right.